

Appln. No. 09/739,950

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1960

**II. Remarks**

Claims 1 through 5 stand rejected. Claims 1 through 5 are being amended. Accordingly, after entering this amendment, claims 1 through 5 remain pending.

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

*Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)*

Claims 1 through 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent No. 61-295494 to Hoshino et al. (Hoshino) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,078,207 to Asano et al. (Asano).

Hoshino discusses turbulators with louvers spaced along a base of a strip and extending in a direction generally *perpendicular* to a longitudinal axis of the strip. That is, fluid flowing through Hoshino's turbulators flows through the louvers in the direction generally *perpendicular* to the longitudinal axis of the strip. Claims 1 through 5, on the other hand, require louvers that direct fluid to flow through the turbulators *parallel to a longitudinal axis* of a strip along which the louvers are spaced.

Accordingly, Hoshino teaches away from Applicants' invention and therefore neither teaches nor suggests a turbulator with a plurality of louvers spaced along a base of a strip and extending in a direction generally parallel to a longitudinal axis of the strip to direct fluid through the turbulator in the direction generally parallel to the longitudinal axis, as required by amended claims 1 through 5.

As for Asano, that reference also discusses turbulators with louvers spaced along a base of a strip and extending in a direction generally *perpendicular* to a longitudinal axis of the strip. Therefore, Asano does not cure the deficiencies of

Appln. No. 09/739,950

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1960

Hoshino. As such, both Hoshino and Asano teach away from a turbulator with the features recited in amended claims 1 through 5.


Since Applicants' invention as recited in amended claims 1 through 5 is patentably distinguishable over Hoshino alone, or over Hoshino in combination with Asano, reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claims 1 through 5 are respectfully requested.

*Conclusion*

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims (claims 1 through 5) are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted by,

Dated: June 25, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John M. Card  
Reg. No.: 48,423  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. Box 10395  
Chicago, IL 60610  
(734) 302-6000